



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,309	06/13/2000	Manu Kumar	119645-00103.3	7378
7590 Alfred W. Zaher, Esq. BLANK ROME LLP One Logan Square 130 North 18th Street Philadelphia, PA 19103				
09/17/2008				
EXAMINER				
BOUTAH, ALINA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2143				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/17/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/592,309

**Applicant(s)**

KUMAR, MANU

**Examiner**

ALINA N. BOUTAH

**Art Unit**

2143

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12 and 14-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment received September 5, 2008. Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 5, 2008 has been entered.

### ***Specification***

The use of the trademark such as Microsoft PowerPoint, Netscape, etc, has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. For example, MICROSOFT POWERPOINT, NETSCAPE, etc.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,144,991 issued to England in view of USPN 6,108,687 issued to Craig.

Regarding claim 1, England teaches an apparatus for interactive communications over a network among participants of a single conference at a plurality of locations, the apparatus comprising:

a leader computer operatively connected to the network (figure 5: guide computer 506) ;

a computer readable storage device accessible by the leader computer, the storage device including computer instructions for receiving and displaying information from the network (figure 5: piper server 502); and

computer instructions for transmitting the information to a plurality of other computers over the network, wherein said other computers each generally simultaneously displays the transmitted information (abstract – “The remotely displayable frames are transmitted to the client so that both the guide and the client have identical views of the remotely displayable frames.”); said

computer instructions for transmitting comprising a shared web browser to allow the leader to surf through the internet and to cause said other computers to follow the leader through the internet (col. 10, lines 37-52 – client receiving internet resources under control of the guide, the guide coordinating collaborative tools such as chat program, whiteboard, etc), wherein various combinations of shared web browsers can be used for the leader and the other computers (i.e. Netscape vs. Internet Explorer); and

computer instructions for receiving additional information entered in a shared web browser white board from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the additional information in the shared web browser whiteboard, and wherein the additional information is entered by a user of a computer from the plurality of other computers to be associated with the already displayed information (figure 10 which includes whiteboard and chat program as an alternative to telephone conference); and

computer instructions for receiving text-based conferencing information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the text-base conferencing information in a shared web browser window separate from the white board, thereby not altering the information displayed in the shared web browser and the shared web browser white board (figure 10 – whiteboard on top frame and chat window on the bottom right frame, the chat window displays text-based conferencing information and does not alter what is in the whiteboard).

However, England does not explicitly teach wherein the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously. In analogous art, Craig teaches the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously (abstract – instructor computer and student computers participating in one conference). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable the leader and other computers to participate in no more than one conference because it is easier to manage, thus ensure the likelihood that communications are synchronized.

Regarding claim 2, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein the network comprises the Internet (figure 1 – internet 101).

Regarding claim 3, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein said computer instructions for receiving and displaying information from the network comprises a web browser (i.e. figure 3).

Regarding claim 8, England teaches a method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants of a single conference situated at two or more locations, wherein each of said participants has a computer operatively connected to a computer network, the method comprising:

a) providing a website on the computer network for said participants to obtain access to the collaborative presentation (i.e. figure 3);

b) providing information to be displayed on each of said participants' computers during the collaborative presentation (i.e. figure 10);

c) providing means for said participants to access the website (i.e. figure 6); and

d) initiating the collaborative presentation by one of said plurality of participants presenting the information on the one of said participants' computers, wherein the computer of each of the other of said plurality of participants generally simultaneously displays the information (figure 8).

e) interactively adding information associated with the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants in a shared web browser white board, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the additional information in the shared web browser white board (col. 5, lines 37-54); and

f) initiating a text-based conferencing by one of the other of said plurality of participants, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the text-based conferencing information in a shared web browser window separate from the white board, thereby not altering the information displayed in the shared web browser and the shared web browser white board (figure 10 – chat program).

However, England does not explicitly teach wherein the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously. In analogous art, Craig teaches the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously (abstract – instructor computer and student computers participating in one conference). At the time the invention was made, one of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable the leader and other computers to participate in no more than one conference because it is easier to manage, thus ensure the likelihood that communications are synchronized.

Regarding claim 9, England teaches a method of conducting a conference among a plurality of participants situated at two or more locations over a computer network, the method comprising:

- a) providing a website on the computer network (i.e. figure 3);
- b) providing means for said participants to access the website via a computer having a display (i.e. figure 6);
- c) providing a browser interface for conducting the conference (i.e. figure 10), wherein various combinations of shared web browsers can be used for the leader and the other computers (i.e. Netscape vs. Internet Explorer);
- d) operably connecting each said participants' computers such that the display of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the shared browser interface (abstract – guide computer and client computers simultaneously displaying same information); and
- e) providing a white board to allow each participants to enter additional information associated with the display of the shared browser interface having identical information in a main window (abstract), the additional information being displayed in the white board, thereby not altering the display of the shared browser interface (figure 10 – chat program).



However, England does not explicitly teach wherein the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously. In analogous art, Craig teaches the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously (abstract – instructor computer and student computers participating in one conference). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable the leader and other computers to participate in no more than one conference because it is easier to manage, thus ensure the likelihood that communications are synchronized.

Regarding claim 10, England teaches as recited in claim 9 further including the step of categorizing said participants into one of a presenter participant or an attendee participant, such that the presenter participants' computer controls each of said attendee participants' computers via the browser interface (abstract – guide computer controlling client computers).

Regarding claim 11, this is similar to claim 9 because all the elements listed are essentially the same as claim 9 but in apparatus form rather than method form. Furthermore, claim 11 further recites computer instructions providing text based communication interface in a separate shared browser window, thereby not altering the display in the shared browser interface or in the whiteboard, to allow each participant to initiate and participate in text-based conferencing during the conference (figure 10 –

chat program in addition to the whiteboard, the chat window is separate from the whiteboard, thus not altering the content of the whiteboard).

Regarding claim 12, England teaches the method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants as recited in claim 5, further including the step of initiating display of a list of all of the plurality of participants (figure 34 – “list clients”).

Regarding claim 14, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, further comprising computer instructions for transmitting comments or questions from any one or more of the plurality of other computers to the leader computer (figure 10 – user can submit questions to guide in the chat window).

Regarding claim 15, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, further comprising computer instructions for assigning different color to the text-based conferencing information received in the leader computer of each of the plurality of other computers to identify origination of the text-based conferencing information (col. 5, lines 27-36).

Regarding claim 17, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, further comprising computer instructions for terminating, from the leader computer, a

connection of any one or more of the plurality of other computers from the network (figure 30 – terminating a session).

Regarding claim 18, England teaches an apparatus for interactive communications over a network among participants of a single conference at a plurality of locations, the apparatus comprising:

a plurality of computers operatively connected to a network, wherein each of the plurality of computers includes a computer readable medium storage device comprising:

computer instructions providing user designation of any one of the plurality of computers as lead computer (figure 5: guide computer 506);

computer instructions for receiving and displaying information from the network (abstract – client computer); and

computer instructions for transmitting to other of the plurality of computers, as lead computer, information received and displayed from the network, wherein the other of the plurality of computers each generally simultaneously display the identical transmitted information, as the lead computer, and wherein the computer instructions for transmitting comprises a shared web browser allowing the other of the plurality of computers to follow the leader through the Internet (abstract).

However, England does not explicitly teach wherein the computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously. In analogous art, Craig teaches the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously (abstract – instructor computer and student computers

participating in one conference). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable the leader and other computers to participate in no more than one conference because it is easier to manage, thus ensure the likelihood that communications are synchronized.

Regarding claim 19, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 18, wherein the network comprises the Internet (figure 1 – internet 101).

Regarding claim 20, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 18, wherein the computer instructions for transmitting comprises a presenter interface (guide) that includes computer instructions for communicating with each of the other of the plurality of computers and for causing information to be generally simultaneously displayed on the other of the plurality of computers (abstract – guide presenting information to client and simultaneously display information).

Regarding claim 21, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 18, further comprising computer instructions for receiving additional information entered in a shared web browser white board from at least one of the other of the plurality of computers over the network, wherein the other of the plurality of computers and the leader computer each generally simultaneously display the additional information in the shared web browser white board, and wherein the additional information is entered by a

user of a computer from the other of the plurality of computers (figure 10 – chat program).

Regarding claim 22, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 21, further comprising computer instructions for receiving text-based conferencing information from at least one of the other of the plurality of computers over the network, wherein the other of the plurality of computers and the leader computer each generally simultaneously display the text-based conferencing information in a shared web browser window separate from the white board, thereby not altering the information displayed in the shared web browser window and the shared web browser white board (figure 10 – chat program separate from whiteboard).

Regarding claim 23, teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 22, further comprising computer instructions for assigning different color to the text-based conferencing information received, the color identifying origination of the text-based conferencing information (col. 5, lines 27-36).

Regarding claim 25, the apparatus as recited in claim 18, further comprising computer instructions for initiating designation of one of the other of the plurality of computers as a replacement leader computer, wherein a presentation of information on, or a selection of a web site in, the replacement leader computer causes the information presented, or the web site selected, to be generally simultaneously displayed on each of

the other of the plurality of computers (col. 5, lines 26-36 – “share pointer” in which any user can select any feature and all other users will see the same, therefore it is broadly interpreted as leader’s designation).

Regarding claim 26, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 18, further comprising computer instructions for transmitting comments or questions from any one or more of the other of the plurality of computers to the leader computer (figure 10 – chat program for client to send questions or comments to guide).

Regarding claim 27, the apparatus as recited in claim 18, further comprising computer instructions for terminating, from the leader computer, a connection of any one or more of the other of the plurality of computers from the network (figure 30 – terminating a session).

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of Craig, in further view of *Using Microsoft PowerPoint 2000* by Rutledge et al.

Regarding claim 5, England teaches a method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants situated at two or more locations, wherein each of said participants has a computer operatively connected to a computer network, the method comprising:

a) providing a web site on the computer network for a said participants to obtain access to the collaborative presentation (figure 6);

c) providing information to be displayed on each of said participant's computers during the collaborative presentation (abstract); and

e) initiating the collaborative presentation by one of said plurality of participants presenting the information on the leader's computers, wherein the computer of each of the other of said plurality of participants generally simultaneously displays the information on the leader's computer (figure 9);

f) interactively adding information associated with the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants in a shared web browser white board, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the additional information in the shared white board (figure 10);

g) sharing a web browser of one of said plurality of participants with each of the other of said plurality of participants, so that the shared web browser causes the plurality of participants to collectively surf through the internet according to web sites selected by the leader on the leader's computer (abstract); and

h) initiating the leader's designation of one of the other of said plurality of participants as a new leader, wherein a presentation of information, or a selection of a web site, on the new leader's computer causes the information presented, or web site selected, on the new leader's computer to be generally simultaneously displayed on the computer of each of the other of said plurality of participants (col. 5, lines 26-36 – "share

pointer" in which any user can select any feature and all other users will see the same, therefore it is broadly interpreted as leader's designation).

However, England does not explicitly teach:

- b) sending a message to each of said plurality of participants, the message providing an identifier means for accessing the collaborative presentation; and
- d) accessing the website to the identifier means.

In an analogous art, Rutledge teaches b) and d) (Chapter 17, Using Online Broadcasts and Meetings pages 1-11). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable said identifier means to comprise a scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation in order to ensure that participants will access the presentation at the specific time and date, therefore, ensuring that those that are intended to participate in the presentation will not be left out.

Regarding claim 6, England teaches the method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants as recited in claim 5, further including the step of initiating a telephone conference call while conducting the collaborative presentation (col. 6, lines 53-54 - telephone to call for personal assistance).

Regarding claim 7, England does not explicitly teach the method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants as recited in claim 5, wherein said identifier means comprises one or more of a confirmation number, and a scheduled



date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation. Rutledge et al. teaches said identifier means comprises a scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation (Chapter 17, Using Online Broadcasts and Meetings pages 1-11). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable said identifier means to comprise a scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation in order to ensure that participants will access the presentation at the specific time and date, therefore, ensuring that those that are intended to participate in the presentation will not be left out.

Claims 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of Craig, in further view of Examiner's Official Notice.

Regarding claims 16 and 24, although England does not explicitly teach computer instructions for blocking the text-based conferencing information forwarded from any one or more of the plurality of other computers, he teaches a chat program that is included in the conferencing information (i.e. figure 10). The Examiner takes official notice that in a chat program, a feature of blocking a text-based conferencing information is well known in the art.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

As stated in the previous office action dated June 23, 2008, claims 4 and 13 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-23 and 25-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 8-12, 15, 16 and 27 have been considered but are not found persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Craig teaches what is lacking in England. Specifically, Craig teaches that the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously, while England teaches everything else as claimed.

***Conclusion***

It is noted that the column, line, and/or page number citations used in the prior art references as applied by the Examiner to the claimed invention are for the convenience of the Applicant to represent the relevant teachings of the prior art. The prior art references may contain further teachings and/or suggestions that may further distinguish the citations applied to the claims, therefore, the Applicant should consider the entirety of these prior art references during the process of responding to this Office Action. It is further noted that any alternative and non-preferred embodiments as taught and/or suggested within the prior art references also constitute prior art and the prior art references may be relied upon for all the teachings would have reasonably suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2123.

The prior art listed in the PT0-892 form included with this Office Action disclose methods, systems, and apparatus similar to those claimed and recited in the specification. The Examiner has cited these references to evidence the level and/or knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to provide support for universal facts and the technical reasoning for the rejections made in this Office Action including the Examiner's broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims as required by MPEP 2111 and to evidence the plain meaning of any terms not defined in the specification that are interpreted by the Examiner in accordance with MPEP 2111.01. The Applicant should consider these cited references when preparing a response to this Office Action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALINA N. BOUTAH whose telephone number is (571)272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia L.M. Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alina N Boutah/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2143